

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 282 936

TM 870 392

AUTHOR Anderson, Paul S.; Alexander, Diane
TITLE Multi-Digit (MDT) Testing in the Teaching of Criminal Justice Sciences.
PUB DATE Mar 86
NOTE 18p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences (Orlando, FL, March 17-21, 1986).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Computer Assisted Testing; Computer Software; Criminal Law; Higher Education; *Objective Tests; Recall (Psychology); *Scoring; Teacher Made Tests; Test Construction; *Test Format
IDENTIFIERS *Criminal Justice; Multi Digit Tests

ABSTRACT

The Multi-Digit (MDT) testing procedure is a computer-scored testing innovation conceptualized in 1982. It is fully compatible with multiple choice and true/false tests well suited for the testing of discreet terms and concepts such as in fill-in-the-blank examinations. The student reads the question and selects the appropriate response from an alphabetically organized, lengthy list on which each term is numbered. With three-digit numbers, there can be up to 999 items on a list, far too many for any student to peruse in an attempt to recognize the correct answer. The student is required to recall the correct answer, locate it on the alphabetical list and then place the code number on the computer readable answer sheet. The paper explains how to use MDT in teaching and evaluating an Introduction to Criminal Justice course. A sample MDT test and actual MDT lists for major clinical justice terms and concepts are appended. (Author/JAZ)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED282936

MULTI-DIGIT (MDT) TESTING IN THE TEACHING OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE SCIENCES

Paul S. Anderson
Geography-Geology Department
Illinois State University
Normal, IL 61761

Diane Alexander
Criminal Justice Sciences Dept.
Illinois State University
Normal, IL 61761

ABSTRACT

The Multi-Digit (MDT) testing procedure is a new addition to computer scored testing and is fully compatible with multiple choice and true/false tests. It is especially well suited for the testing of discreet terms and concepts such as in fill-in-the blank examinations. The student reads the question and selects the appropriate response from an alphabetically organized, lengthy list on which each term is numbered. With three-digit numbers, there can be up to 999 items on a list, far too many for any student to peruse in an attempt to recognize the correct answer. The student is required to recall the correct answer, locate it on the alphabetical list and then place the code number on the computer readable answer sheet. Actual MDT lists for major Criminal Justice terms and concepts are provided in this paper which also explains how to put the Multi-Digit testing innovation into immediate practical use for the teaching of the Introduction to Criminal Justice courses on any campus.

A presentation to the Annual Meeting of the Academy of Criminal Justice Sciences, Orlando, Florida, 17-21 March 1986.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P. S. Anderson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

INTRODUCTION

Teaching a course on the Introduction to Criminal Justice Sciences requires a variety of evaluation techniques in order to assess the students' learning in the various components of that course. The higher order forms of learning which require synthesis and evaluation by the students are traditionally tested with essay tests or single paragraph answers. Important as that element of testing is, essays are not the best method for determining if the students have mastered the basic factual information which is essential for anyone to have a firm grasp on the topic of Criminal Justice Sciences. To determine that knowledge professors commonly utilize multiple choice or fill-in-the-blank tests. The multiple choice method has the obvious disadvantage of encouraging recognition, the elimination of alternatives, and outright guessing. It is hard to imagine that someone would not pick out the term from a selection of five names. Furthermore, the onus is on the professor to devise the four wrong answers (foils) that are supposed to have a reasonable likelihood of being selected if the student does not recognize the correct answer. The result is that students frequently avoid the full learning of essential factual information in a course, whether introductory or at an advanced level, because they are good at recognition and the elimination of foils.

It is much more difficult to recall from memory and write down specific answers. Recall requires that the information be learned better. Therefore, considering that some of that factual information should become part of the basic knowledge of an educated person, professors sometimes opt for tests where one or

two word answers must be written. The questions are actually easier to write than those of a multiple choice test because no alternative answers are required. The major difficulty with such fill-in-the-blank style tests is that the professor must be willing to devote significant time to their grading, especially if mastery learning is desired. What would be useful is a computer scored fill-in-the-blank style test of terms and concepts about Criminal Justice Sciences that could be quickly generated and graded, complete with statistical analyses. Then the essential learning can be required and tested while freeing the professor for essay scoring, student advisement, research and other activities more productive than manual test scoring.

The Multi-Digit (MDT) testing innovation is a computer scored approximation of a fill-in-the-blank test. It is ideally suited for the evaluation (and stimulation) of learning of the factual information essential to a course such as the Introduction to Criminal Justice Sciences. Not only does it make the test scoring faster, it also makes the formulation of the test questions extremely easy and, according to recent research discussed in the next section, contributes to improved student learning during the semester and greater retention even after the conclusion of the course. With fast computer scoring of quickly generated tests which require student recall rather than recognition, a professor can more easily specify the level of competence required from the students. In that way, any student who does not meet that minimum requirement can be given additional tests until that requirement is met. The MDT materials included in the appendix of this paper permit such a

learning requirement to be specified by the professor in a course on Criminal Justice Sciences.

The Multi-Digit method requires the student to select the desired answer from very long lists of alternative responses. In the answer sheet format shown in the appendix, the three-digit responses mean that up to 999 alternative answers can be on a single list. (Two-digit and four-digit versions are being developed.) Those lists of responses need only be prepared once or maybe revised at the beginning of each course. In the case of Introduction to Criminal Justice Sciences, the initial long lists that could be used by any professor are provided in the appendices of this paper; they are sufficient for literally thousands of questions. In other words, there is no need for the professor to be concerned with the incorrect alternative answers if the correct term for a given question is found on one of the lists. There are many ways of phrasing questions which would utilize these long lists of answers. Furthermore, the MDT innovation will accomodate numeric answers of three digits.

BACKGROUND AND RESEARCH

The Multi-Digit long list testing method was first conceptualized in the fall of 1982 by Dr. Anderson, co-author of this paper. It has subsequently been used for seven consecutive semesters with over 700 students in a course on World Regional Geography. It is currently being used in the disciplines of home economics, art appreciation, mathematics, history, military science, English, political science, earth science, computer programming and chemistry. Instructors have created lists for

their subject matter and have used it in the classroom with several thousand university students. In addition, the largest single course to use the method has 1200 criminal justice students this semester, under the coordination of Diane Alexander, a co-author of this paper.

Because of the almost complete elimination of guessing on the Multi-Digit method in comparison to traditional multiple choice tests, the students' scores may be generally lower on an MDT test. There may also be a wider spread from the very lowest score to the highest score attained by students. Both of those characteristics can be advantageous to the professor. The traditionally accepted percentages of 90% and above being an A should not be applied to the MDT testing situations unless the professor intentionally modifies the examination material so that there are sufficient easy questions to allow the attainment of the specified percentages. In all cases, the individual professor remains independent and in charge of his or her particular class.

One of the key questions in evaluating this new testing technique concerns whether the students learned and retained more than they would have if studying for a traditional multiple choice test. Exploratory research conducted by Anderson, Hill, Naim and Walters (1985a) with nearly 200 students enrolled in World Geography, revealed that students who study for a fill-in-the-blank test or a Multi-Digit long list test retain more of their learning at the end of the semester than do students who studied the same material for a multiple choice test with five

alternative answers. These results are exactly as hypothesized. Furthermore, when students gain more familiarity with the MDT method, their results are expected to become even more similar to the greater learning and retention of the fill-in-the-blank method.

MDT Test Construction

Lists of terms preferably for the entire course should be constructed prior to the first test using the MDT format. The lists (see appendix) can be divided into different subject areas such as terms and concepts, names, amendments, places, court cases, professional organizations and agencies. The subject areas with few terms should be grouped together to increase the requirement of recall and reduce recognition. All of these lists could be combined into one. Sample lists for textbooks by Cole and Inciardi are attached to this paper.

Terms for the lists may be pooled from numerous sources, including glossaries and indexes. Terms from personal notes should also be included to cover specific lecture material. As a final resource, student study guides and instructor's manuals usually list key terms and concepts.

Test questions using responses on the MDT list need to be constructed with some caution. Questions should not have multiple possible answers on the list. An example, if the terms law enforcement and police are both on the list, there could be two correct answers for hastily prepared questions. The development of questions also involves a consciousness of the time required to answer the test because of the extra sheet of paper plus more marks to fill in. Students generally take

slightly longer to answer this style of questions. However, fewer questions are needed because of the increased academic rigor of recall. A short demonstration test early in the semester will provide the students with an in-depth understanding of the MDT answer format method to alleviate "test anxiety" and mental blocks caused by the newness of the testing procedure. The pre-test also is an indicator to the students of the increased amount of studying time required to prepare for this test procedure.

Test Results

Computer programs for the grading of MDT tests provide sub-total scores for groups of questions and for each style of scores to be prepared on both the tests using MDT lists and any other format questions (ie: essay, MDT long list, multiple choice and true/false). This allows for the student to compare results and also detect weaknesses in study habits. Further computer generated results also indicate to the student their actual word answers as well as the correct answers because each term is in the computer under its code number. This feature helps the students clarify any misconceptions of the definitions or usage of description terms or concepts. Further explanations of the MDT method are in the book The MDT Educational Innovation (Anderson, 1986).

Conclusions

The use of MDT in Criminal Justice Sciences can be rewarding to the instructor as well as the student. In introductory courses, such as the one at ISU, this testing format reduces

cheating, facilitates question generation (although the lists can stay the same) so that tests can easily be changed from term to term, and provides an outlet for in-depth testing to instructors in both large lecture halls and small classrooms. Approximately 1500 Introduction to Criminal Justice Sciences Courses students have taken the test and admitted it is harder but it encourages better study skills and negates "all-nighters" performed the day before the test. There has been a substantial increase in the number of students taking advantage of seminars, small groups and test review since the change to this form of testing.

At Illinois State University, the students and faculty have found positive results from this testing, not only in the area of Criminal Justice but also in other disciplines. Upper level courses as well as introductory courses are able to provide the student with the educational benefits of a fill-in-the-blank test without the time of manual grading.

NOTE: The Multi-Digit Technologies (MDT) Corporation offers start-up assistance to any instructor wanting to use the MDT innovations. For further information, telephone 309-452-7072 or write to P.O. Box 14, Normal, Illinois 61761. MDT and Multi-Digit are trademarks of the MDT Corporation.

Demonstration M.D.T. Test
[Use Cole List]

Terms & Concepts

1. Defendants who are awaiting trial/sentencing or serving a period of imprisonment not to exceed one year are housed in (203).
2. The individuals in Normal who have the power to arrest, ride around in cars with lights and sirens and wear a badge and gun are referred to as the Normal (256) Department.
3. Hinckley was relieved of his criminal responsibility for attempting to assassinate Ronald Reagan because of his accepted plea of (197).
4. There are two categories of crimes, misdemeanor and (175).
5. The T.V. show, "The People's Court" involves informal processing of cases decided by a retired (204).
6. Miami (320) is a top-rated T.V. program which involves a realistic (ha! ha!) portrayal of detective work.

Names

7. The individual who researched the effectiveness of treatment programs and rehabilitation efforts and concluded with "nothing works" is (566).

Amendments/Court Cases/Organizations/Places

8. This court has eight males and one female on it (782).
9. The state which borders Illinois and is where the baseball team "The St. Louis Cardinals" is from is (755).
10. The freedom of religion, freedom of speech and the right to assemble are rights given to us in the Constitution under the (704) amendment.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0	0 0 0
1 1 1	1 1 1	1 1 1	1 1 1	1 1 1	1 1 1	1 1 1	1 1 1	1 1 1	1 1 1
2 2 2	2 2 2	2 2 2	2 2 2	2 2 2	2 2 2	2 2 2	2 2 2	2 2 2	2 2 2
3 3 3	3 3 3	3 3 3	3 3 3	3 3 3	3 3 3	3 3 3	3 3 3	3 3 3	3 3 3
4 4 4	4 4 4	4 4 4	4 4 4	4 4 4	4 4 4	4 4 4	4 4 4	4 4 4	4 4 4
5 5 5	5 5 5	5 5 5	5 5 5	5 5 5	5 5 5	5 5 5	5 5 5	5 5 5	5 5 5
6 6 6	6 6 6	6 6 6	6 6 6	6 6 6	6 6 6	6 6 6	6 6 6	6 6 6	6 6 6
7 7 7	7 7 7	7 7 7	7 7 7	7 7 7	7 7 7	7 7 7	7 7 7	7 7 7	7 7 7
8 8 8	8 8 8	8 8 8	8 8 8	8 8 8	8 8 8	8 8 8	8 8 8	8 8 8	8 8 8
9 9 9	9 9 9	9 9 9	9 9 9	9 9 9	9 9 9	9 9 9	9 9 9	9 9 9	9 9 9

COLE: Sample Questions

1. The large amount of plea bargaining which makes our court system similar to that of a revolving door, and the impersonality existing in some part of the criminal justice system has led to our system of justice being referred to as one of (108) justice.
2. The chief law enforcement officers of a county are termed (298).
3. The formalized definitions of offenses which specify all their characteristics is referred to (308) law.
4. Name the primary individual who believed that physical attributes and heredity were for causing criminal behavior (561).
5. With few exceptions, police officers need a search warrant to search your house because of the rights granted by the (706) amendment.

INCIARDI: Sample Questions

1. Liability imposed on an employer for certain illegal acts of his employees committed during their employment is named (228).
2. The administrative record of an arrest is the (21) stage of the criminal justice process.
3. (34) involves legal action of one individual against another individual and is structured to regulate the rights between individuals or organizations.
4. The federal agency created to lead the "war on crime" and was a provision of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act is (139).
5. In the court case (329), the United States Supreme Court reversed a lower court decision on the grounds that offenses such as "being addicted to the use of narcotics" were unconstitutional and that imprisonment for such an offense was cruel and unusual punishment in violation of the Eighth Amendment.

[illegible]

(COLE) MDT LISTS for CRIMINAL JUSTICE

TERMS & CONCEPTS

- | | | | |
|----------|-------------------------------------|--|--|
| A | 101 Actual enforcement | 177 Female criminals | 253 Penology |
| | 102 Actus reus | 178 Field interrogation | 254 Peremptory challenge |
| | 103 Adjudication | 179 Filtering process | 255 Plea bargaining |
| | 104 Appeals | 180 Full enforcement | 256 Police |
| | 105 Apprehension process | 181 Fundamental fairness | 257 Police brutality |
| | 106 Arraignment | 182 Furloughs | 258 Police interrogation |
| | 107 Arrest | 183 General deterrence | 259 Police organization |
| | 108 Assembly-line justice | 184 Good time | 260 Police women |
| | 109 Assigned counsel | 185 Grand jury | 261 Political crimes |
| | 110 Auburn system | 186 Gross esters | 262 Preliminary hearing |
| B | 111 Bail | 187 Homicide | 263 Preplea conference |
| | 112 Bill of Rights | 188 Huber Act | 264 Presentence investigation |
| | 113 Biopsychological explanations | 189 Incapacitation | 265 Pretrial detention |
| | 114 Black judges | 190 Incarceration | 266 Pretrial motions |
| | 115 Blue-Coat crime | 191 Indeterminate sentences | 267 Pretrial processes |
| | 116 Bondsman | 192 Index crimes | 268 Preventive detention |
| C | 117 Bureaucracy | 193 Indictment | 269 Preventive patrol |
| | 118 Capital punishment | 194 Information | 270 Prisoners' rights |
| | 119 Case law | 195 Initial appearance | 271 Proactive |
| | 120 Challenge for cause | 196 Inmate code | 272 Probation |
| | 121 Child savers | 197 Insanity | 273 Procedural criminal law |
| | 122 Classification | 198 Intake | 274 Procedural due process |
| | 123 Clearance rate | 199 Internal affairs unit | 275 Prosecuting attorney |
| | 124 Code of secrecy | 200 Interrogation | 276 Prostitution |
| | 125 Collective bargaining | 201 Investigation | 277 Public defender |
| | 126 Common law | 202 Irresistible impulse Test | 278 Punishment |
| | 127 Community corrections | 203 Jails | 279 Rand Institute Study |
| | 128 Consensus model | 204 Judge | 280 Reactive |
| | 129 Conceptual framework | 205 Judicial selection | 281 Recidivism |
| | 130 Concurrence | 206 Jurisdiction | 282 Rehabilitation |
| | 131 Conflict model | 207 Jury | 283 Reintegration model |
| | 132 Constitutional protections | 208 Jury selection | 284 Release on recognizance (ROR) |
| | 133 Copping out | 209 Jury trial | 285 Resource allocation |
| | 134 Corrections | 210 Juvenile corrections | 286 Resource dependence |
| | 135 County | 211 Juvenile court | 287 Restitution |
| | 136 Court | 212 Juvenile crime | 288 Retribution |
| | 137 Courtroom workgroup | 213 Juvenile justice | 289 Revocation |
| | 138 Courts of general jurisdiction | 214 Kansas City Response Time Analysis Study | 290 Right to counsel |
| | 139 Crime | 215 Labeling theory | 291 Searches and seizures |
| | 140 Crime control model | 216 Law Enforcement Education Program (LEEP) | 292 Selective enforcement |
| | 141 Crime rate | 217 Law enforcement | 293 Sentence disparity |
| | 142 Criminal justice system | 218 Legal guilt | 294 Sentencing council |
| | 143 Criminal responsibility | 219 Legal sufficiency | 295 Sentencing guidelines |
| | 144 Criminal sanction | 220 Legalistic style | 296 Sentencing institute |
| | 145 Criminogenic | 221 Legislative process | 297 Sentencing review |
| | 146 Critical criminology | 222 Local | 298 Sheriffs |
| | 147 Cruel and unusual punishment | 223 Low visibility | 299 Sociological explanations |
| | 148 Custodial model | 224 M'Naghten Rule | 300 Specific deterrence |
| D | 149 Deadly force | 225 Mala in se | 301 Stare decisis |
| | 150 Death penalty | 226 Mala prohibita | 302 State corrections |
| | 151 Defense attorney | 227 Mandatory sentences | 303 Status offense |
| | 152 Deinstitutionalization | 228 Meat eaters | 304 Statutes |
| | 153 Delinquent | 229 Mens rea | 305 Structural theory |
| | 154 Detention | 230 Minority police officers | 306 Subculture |
| | 155 Determinate sentences | 231 Misdemeanor | 307 Substantial Capacity Test |
| | 156 Deterrence | 232 Missouri Merit Selection Plan | 308 Substantive criminal law |
| | 157 Differential association theory | 233 Murder | 309 System efficiency |
| | 158 Discovery | 234 Necessarily included offense | 310 Team policing |
| | 159 Discretion | 235 Neglected child | 311 Total enforcement |
| | 160 Diversion | 236 Nolle prosequi | 312 Traffic |
| | 161 Double jeopardy | 237 Nolo contendere | 313 Trial |
| | 162 Dual court system | 238 Nonpartisan election | 314 Trial proceedings |
| | 163 Due process | 239 Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act | 315 Trial sufficiency |
| | 164 Durham Rule | 240 Order maintenance | 316 U.S. Constitution |
| E | 165 Eighth Amendment | 241 Organized crime | 317 Uniform Crime Reports |
| | 166 English police tradition | 242 Overcriminalization | 318 Unreasonable searches and seizures |
| | 167 Exchange relationships | 243 PINS/CINS/JINS | 319 Upperworld crime |
| | 168 Exchange system | 244 Parens patriae | 320 Vice |
| | 169 Exclusionary rule | 245 Parole | 321 Victimization surveys |
| | 170 Factual guilt | 246 Parole officer | 322 Victimless |
| F | 171 Federal | 247 Partisan election | 323 Victimology |
| | 172 Federal courts | 248 Patrol | 324 Visible crime |
| | 173 Federal prison system | 249 Patrol function | 325 Voir dire |
| | 174 Federalism | 250 Penal code | 326 Watchman style |
| | 175 Felony | 251 Penitentiary | 327 White-collar crime |
| | 176 Female corrections | 252 Pennsylvania system | 328 Women prisoners |
| | | | 329 Women's prisons |
| | | | 330 Work and educational release |

NAMES

A 501 Adler-Mueller, Freda
502 Alex, Nicholas
503 Ashburn, Franklin G.
504 Augustus, John
B 505 Bailey, F. Lee
506 Baldwin, James
507 Baldwin, Lola
508 Beaumont, Gustave Auguste
509 Becker, Howard
510 Bentham, Jeremy
511 Black, Donald J.
512 Black, Hugo R.
513 Braly, Malcolm
514 Brennan, William
515 Crockwyt, Tebulon
516 Buckley, James M.
517 Bugliosi, Vincent
C 518 Burger, Warren
519 Carter, Jimmy
520 Chambliss, William
521 Clark, Ramsey
522 Clear, Todd
523 Cressay, Donald
524 Crockett, George W.
525 Crofton, Sir Walter
526 Darrow, Clarence Seward
D 527 Davis, Benjamin M.
528 Dewey, Thomas E.
529 Durkheim, Emile
E 530 Erikson, Kai
531 Ferri, Enrico
532 Fielding, John and Henry
533 Fogelson, Robert
534 Ford, Gerald B.
535 Frankel, Marvin C.

536 Frankfurter, Felix
537 Freud, Sigmund
538 Fried, Joseph P.
539 Pyfs, James
G 540 Garofalo, Raffaele
541 Gault, Gerald
542 Gideon, Clarence Earl
543 Goffman, Irving
544 Goldfarb, Ronald
H 545 Hall, Jerome
546 Holmes, Oliver Wendell
547 Hoover, J. Edgar
I 548 Ianni, Francis A. J.
549 James, Howard
550 Johnson, Frank M., Jr.
551 Johnson, Lyndon B.
K 552 Kaufman, Irving A.
553 Kennedy, John F.
554 Kennedy, Robert
L 555 LaFave, Wayne
556 Lemert, Edwin
557 Levin, Martin A.
558 Levine, Robert A.
559 Lindsay, Ben B.
560 Lippman, David
561 Lombroso, Cesare
M 562 MacDonochie, Alexander
563 Manson, Charles
564 Marshall, Thurgood
565 Martin, Susan
566 Martinson, Robert
567 McNamara, Joohn H.
568 Morrie, Norval
N 569 Niderhoffer, Arthur
570 Nixon, Richard M.

O 571 Oswald, Lee Harvey
572 Packer, Herbert L.
573 Payne, Donald
574 Peel, Sir Robert
575 Phillips, Steven
576 Pound, Roscoe
P 577 Quinney, Richard
578 Reagan, Ronald
579 Reiss, Albert J., Jr.
580 Rubin, Jesse
581 Rubin, Ted
582 Rubinstein, Jonathan
583 Rush, Benjamin
584 Sandburg, Carl
S 585 Sarbin, Theodore R.
586 Schlesinger, Steven
587 Seidman, Robert B.
588 Serpico
589 Simon, Rita
590 Skolnick, Jerome
591 Smith, William French
592 Stoddard, Eliwyn R.
593 Sutherland, Edwin H.
T 594 Taft, William Howard
595 Taylor, Alice Felt
596 Tocqueville, Alexis de
V 597 Vanderbilt, Arthur
598 Vollmer, August
599 Von Hirsch, Andrew
600 Wainwright, Loudon
W 601 Wallach, Irving A.
602 Warren, Earl
603 White, Byron R.
604 Wilson, James Q.
605 Wilson, Orland Winfield
606 Wright, J. Skelly

AMENDMENTS/COURTCASES/

ORGANIZATIONS/PLACES

A 701 AFSCME
702 Amendment, Eighth
703 Amendment, Fifth
704 Amendment, First
705 Amendment, Fourteenth
706 Amendment, Fourth
707 Amendment, Sixth
708 American Bar Association
709 American Judicature Society
710 American Prison
711 Appellate courts
712 Argeringer v. Hamlin
713 Attica Correctional
714 Attorney General's Task
715 Auburn
B 716 Bell v. Wolfish
717 Carroll v. U.S.
C 718 Chime v. California
719 Civilian review board
720 Community
721 Cooper v. Pate
722 Courts of first instance
723 Courts of general
724 Criminal bar
D 725 Durham v. United States
726 Elmira
727 Elmira Reformatory
728 England
729 Escobedo v. Illinois
F 730 Federal Bureau of
Investigations

731 Fraternal Order of Police
732 Furman v. Georgia
G 733 Gagnon v. Scarpelli
734 Gideon v. Wainwright
735 Great Britain
736 Gregg v. Georgia
737 In re Gault
I 738 In re Winship
739 Interest group
740 International Association
741 International Brotherhood
742 International Conference
743 International Union of
744 Johnson v. Avery
J 745 Joliet
K 746 Kansas City
747 Kent v. U.S.
748 Knapp Commission
L 749 LOJ Enforcement
Assistance Admin.
M 750 Mapp v. Ohio
751 McKeiver v. Pennsylvania
752 Mempa v. Rhay
753 Minority police officers
754 Miranda v. Arizona
755 Missouri
756 Morrissey v. Brewer
N 757 Nat'l Advisory Comm. on
Crim. Just. Standards
758 Nat'l Advisory Commission
on Civil Disorders

759 Nat'l Comm. on Causes
Prevention of Violence
760 Nat'l Council on Crime
and Delinquency
761 National Census of Jails
762 National Crime Surveys
763 National Prison
Association
764 New Mexico State Prison
P 765 PROMIS
766 Pennsylvania
767 Police Foundation
768 Police unions
769 Powell v. Alabama
770 President's Commission
on Law Enforcement
771 Procunier v. Martinez
772 Puritan Massachusetts
773 Rainfall West
774 Sanotello v. New York
775 State courts
776 Terry v. Ohio
777 U.S. Bureau of Prisons
778 U.S. Bureau of Prisons
779 U.S. Bureau of the Census
780 U.S. Court of Appeals
781 U.S. District Courts
782 U.S. Supreme Court
783 U.S. v. Robinson
784 United States
W 785 Wickersham Commission
786 Wincanton, U.S.A.
787 Wolff v. McDonnell
788 Women police officers

TERMS & CONCEPTS

A	1 Actual enforcement	G	96 Full enforcement	R	192 Partisan election
	2 Actus reus		97 Purlough		193 Patrol
	3 Adjudication		98 General deterrence		194 Peacekeeping
	4 Administrative law		99 Good time		195 Penal code
	5 Adversary system		100 Grand jury		196 Pennsylvania system
	6 Allocution		101 Grace estate		197 Plain error rule
	7 Appeal		102 Gun control		198 Plain view doctrine
	8 Appellate jurisdiction		103 Habeas corpus		199 Plea negotiation
	9 Arkansas prison scandal		104 Habitual offender laws		200 Police bureaucracy
	10 Atrocity		105 Heads off doctrine		201 Police corruption
B	11 Arrest powers	H	106 Hermies error rule		202 Police presence
	12 Arson		107 Homicide		203 Police professionalism
	13 Assault and battery		108 Huber test		204 Police role
	14 Assembly line justice		109 In forma pauperis		205 Police subculture
	15 Auburn system		110 Incapacitation		206 Police violence
	16 Automatic reversal rule		111 Incarceration		207 Political crime
	17 Bail		112 Indeterminate sentence		208 Police comitatus
	18 Bill of rights		113 Index crimes		209 Premeditation
	19 Blue-tooth crime		114 Indictment		210 Presentence investigation
	20 Bookmen		115 Indigency standards		211 Presentment
C	21 Booking	I	116 Initial appearance		212 Presumptive sentence
	22 Bow street runners		117 Inmate code		213 Pretrial detention
	23 Breaking and entering		118 Inquiry system		214 Preventive detention
	24 Brutality		119 Inquisitorial system		215 Prison
	25 Bureaucracy		120 Inside call		216 Prison community
	26 Burger court		121 Intermittent sentence		217 Prisonization
	27 Burglary		122 Internal policing		218 Probable cause
	28 Capital punishment		123 Interrogation		219 Probation
	29 Carroll doctrine		124 Investigative powers		220 Professional theft
	30 Case law		125 Invited error rule		221 Prosecutors
D	31 Challenge for cause	J	126 Irresistible impulse test		222 Protective sweep doctrine
	32 Child abuse		127 Jail		223 Public order crime
	33 Civil death		128 Judges and justices		224 Rape
	34 Civil law		129 Judicial circuits		225 Reception centers
	35 Civilian review boards		130 Jurisdiction		226 Reformatory
	36 Classical sch. of crim.		131 Jury nullification		227 Release on recognance
	37 Classification		132 Jury selection		228 Repeal of superior
	38 Clearance rate		133 Jury trial		229 Retribution
	39 Comm. based corr.		134 Justice of the peace		230 Retribution
	40 Common law		135 Justifiable homicide		231 Revocation
E	41 Conjugal visitation	K	136 Juvenile court		232 Robbery
	42 Conspiracy		137 Juvenile justice		233 Rule of four
	43 Constabularies		138 KC response time study		234 Salient factor score
	44 Constitutional law		139 LEMMA		235 Search and seizure
	45 Contempt power		140 Labeling theory		236 Self-reported crime
	46 Contract labor		141 Larceny		237 Separate system
	47 Controlled substances act		142 Legal guilt		238 Sequestration
	48 Copping out		143 Legal sufficiency		239 Sheriff
	49 Corporal punishment		144 Legalistic style		240 Shock probation
	50 Counterculture		145 Limited jurisdiction		241 Silent system
F	51 Courts of last resort	L	146 Lock step		242 Speedy trial
	52 Courts of record		147 Low visibility		243 Speedy trial act
	53 Crime		148 Lower courts		244 Statutory law
	54 Crime clock		149 M'Naughten rule		245 Statutory sentencing
	55 Crime control model		150 Male in as		246 Stocks and pillory
	56 Crime index		151 Male prohibitions		247 Stop and frisk
	57 Crime -ats		152 Melice afterthought		248 Substantive due process
	58 Crimes known to police		153 Mandatory release		249 Surety
	59 Criminal law		154 Mandatory sentence		250 Suspended sentence
	60 Critical criminology		155 Manslaughter		251 Texas rangers
G	61 Cynicism	M	156 Mark system		252 Theft
	62 Deadly force		157 Maximum expiration date		253 Thief takers
	63 Death penalty		158 Maximum security		254 Ticket of leave
	64 Defense attorney		159 Heat estate		255 Total institutions
	65 Definite sentence		160 Medium security		256 Transactional immunity
	66 Deinstitutionalization		161 Mens rea		257 Trial by ordeal
	67 Deliberation		162 Minimum security		258 Trial courts
	68 Detective work		163 Minority police officers		259 Trial de novo
	69 Determinate sentence		164 Misdemeanor		260 True bill
	70 Deterrence		165 Mispriison of felony		261 U.S. magistrates
H	71 Deviance	N	166 Missouri plan		262 Uniform crime reports
	72 Discretion		167 Misdemeanor		263 Use immunity
	73 Disorderly conduct		168 Murder		264 Use of force
	74 Diversion		169 Mutual pledge		265 Validity and reliability
	75 Double jeopardy		170 Natural law		266 Venue
	76 Drug revolution		171 Necess. included offenses		267 Victimisation survey
	77 Dual court system		172 Neglected child		268 Vigilance justice
	78 Dual process model		173 Night watch		269 Violent personnel crime
	79 Durham rule		174 No contact		270 Voir dire
	80 English police tradition		175 Nolle prosequi		271 Walnut street jail
I	81 Entrapment	O	176 Nolle contestare		272 War on crime
	82 Evidence-in-chief		177 Nonpartisan election		273 War on heroin
	83 Exchange relationships		178 Nullum crimen sine poena		274 Warren court
	84 Exchange system		179 OGCSEA		275 Watergate
	85 Exclusionary rule		180 Occas. property crime		276 White collar crime
	86 Excusable homicide		181 Open institutions		277 Working personality
	87 Federal prison system		182 Order maintenance		278 Writ of certiorari
	88 Federalism		183 Organized crime		279 Writ of mandamus
	89 Felony		184 Original jurisdiction		
	90 Felony murder doctrine		185 Overcriminalization		
J	91 Female corrections	P	186 PINS/CINS/JINS		
	92 Field interrogations		187 Parole practice		
	93 Filtering process		188 Parole		
	94 French connection (the)		189 Parole prediction		
	95 Fresh pursuit		190 Part I offenses		
			191 Part II offenses		

AMENDMENTS, COURT CASES, ORGANIZATIONS & PLACES

A 280 Am. civil liberties union
281 Amendment, eighth
282 Amendment, fifth
283 Amendment, first
284 Amendment, fourteenth
285 Amendment, fourth
286 Amendment, sixth
287 Argersinger v. Hamlin
288 Attain
B 289 Barron v. Baltimore
290 Benton v. Maryland
291 Batta v. Brady
292 Brady v. U.S.
293 Brewer v. Williams
294 Bush v. Bell
C 295 Chimal v. California
296 Coker v. Georgia
D 297 Coolidge v. New Hampshire
298 DeLoe v. Freness
E 299 Downum v. U.S.
300 Duncan v. Louisiana
301 Escobedo v. Illinois

F 302 Estelle v. Gamble
303 Fareeta v. California
304 Furman v. Georgia
305 Gagnon v. Scarpelli
306 Gideon v. Wainwright
307 Gregg v. Georgia
308 Holt v. Sarver
309 Hurtado v. California
310 Jackson v. Bishop
311 Johnson v. Avery
312 Johnson v. Zerbst
313 Kefauver Committee
314 Klepfer v. North Carolina
315 Knapp commission
316 Lambert v. California
317 Mapp v. Ohio
318 Marbury v. Madison
319 McGautha v. California
320 Heathum v. Fano
321 Hampe v. Shay
322 Miranda v. Arizona
323 Monroe v. Pape

P 324 Morrissey v. Brewer
325 Palko v. Connecticut
326 President's commission
327 Proculiar v. Martinaz
328 Rhodes v. Chapman
329 Robinson v. California
330 Rochin v. California
331 Ruiz v. Estelle
332 Stack v. Boyle
333 Terry v. Ohio
334 U.S. court of appeals
335 U.S. district courts
336 U.S. supreme court
337 U.S. v. Calandra
338 U.S. v. Wade
339 Weeks v. United States
340 Weiss v. United States
341 Wickerham commission
342 Williams v. New York
343 Witherspoon v. Illinois
344 Wolff v. McDonnell

NAMES

A 345 Augustus, John
B 346 Bailey, F. Lee
347 Beccaria, Cesare
348 Becker, Howard
349 Bentham, Jeremy
350 Brockway, Zebulon
351 Burger, Warren
C 352 Carter, Jimmy
353 Cressay, Donald
354 Crofton, Sir Walter
D 355 Darrow, Clarence Seward
356 Durkheim, Emile
357 Erikson, Kai
358 Ferri, Enrico
359 Fogelson, Robert
360 Frankel, Marvin
361 Freud, Sigmund

G 362 Gylfe, James
363 Garofalo, Raffaele
364 Gault, Gerald
365 Gideon, Clarence Earl
366 Hall, Jerome
367 Holmes, Oliver Wendell
368 Hoover, J. Edgar
369 Johnson, Lyndon B.
370 Kennedy, John F.
371 Kennedy, Robert
372 Lanort, Edwin
373 Levine, Robert A.
374 Lombroso, Cesare
375 Macenechia, Alexander
376 Manson, Charles
377 Marshall, John
378 Marshall, Thurgood

N 379 Martinson, Robert
380 Nixon, Richard M.
381 Oswald, Lee Harvey
382 Payne, Donald
383 Paul, Sir Robert
384 Pinkerton, Allen
385 Pound, Roscoe
386 Reagan, Ronald
387 Rush, Benjamin
388 Sandberg, Carl
389 Sarbin, Theodore
390 Sarpico, Frank
391 Skolnick, Jerome
392 Sutherland, Edwin E.
393 Wainwright, London
394 Wilson, James Q.
395 Wilson, Orland Winfield

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anderson, Paul S. (1984a) "An Introduction to the Multi-Digit Test," Discussion Papers in Geography, No. 2: "Objective Testing in Geography," Old Dominion University, Norfolk, Virginia, pp. IV-1 to IV-18, 1984. (This paper was originally presented at the West Lakes Regional Conference of the Association of American Geographers, Iowa City, Iowa, October 1983.)

(1984b) "Applications of the Multi-Digit Test (MDT) Procedure for Teaching the Geography of Latin America." CLAG Communication, Newsletter No. 50, December 1984, pp. 2-3. (Originally presented at the Conference of Latin Americanist Geographers (CLAG), Ottawa, Canada, September 1984.)

Anderson, Paul S., Miriam H. Hill, Shamim Naim and William D. Walters, Jr. (1985a) "Comparison of Cognitive Retention from Three Testing Methods: Fill-in-the-Blank, Multiple Choice and the Multi-Digit Test (MDT)" Illinois School Research and Development, Journal of the Illinois Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Normal, Illinois, Vol. 21, No. 1, Winter 1985, pp. 28-37. (This paper was previously presented at the international conference of the National Council for Geographic Education, Toronto, Canada, October 17-20, 1984.)

Anderson, Paul S. and Eileen Kanzler (1985b) "Laboratory Schools as a Unique Setting for Research: The Experimentation with the Multi-Digit Test (MDT) at Illinois State University High School." A paper presented at the conference of the National Association of Laboratory Schools, in Denver, Colorado, on February 26-28, 1985.

Anderson, Paul S. and Eileen Kanzler (1985c) "Comparison of Cognitive Achievement in Objective Testing: Multi-Digit and Multiple Choice Tests." A paper presented to the conference of the American Educational Research Association (AERA), in Chicago, Illinois, on April 4, 1985.

Anderson, Paul S. (1985d) "Innovations in Educational Testing with Optical Mark Readers: Multi-Digit Large-List Tests, Subjective Question Scores and Instant Scoring in the Classroom," (Abstract only), a discussion session at the World Conference on Computers in Education, Norfolk, Virginia, July 19, 1985.

(1985e) "Applications of the Multi-Digit (MDT) Test in Science Classes." A paper presented to the conference of the Illinois Science Teachers Association (ISTA), in Normal, Illinois, on October 4, 1985.

Anderson, Paul S. (1986) The MDT Educational Testing Innovation. MDT Corporation, Normal, Illinois (in press).

Cole, George The American System of Justice, Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, Monterey, California, 1983.

Inciardi, James Criminal Justice, Academic Press, Inc. Orlando, Florida, 1984.